PROJECT 1291
CLIENT REPORT APPROVAL FORM

I have read: <u>The Addendum to the Mid–Year Technical Report for FY 1988, Objective E,
Task 4</u>, and approve the document for reproduction and distribution.

___ Document approved as is.
___ Approved with noted corrections.
✓ DisApproved

COMMENTS:
There are a number of serious concerns I have regarding this document and the actual conduct of this experiment which, until clarified and corrected, preclude my giving approval.

My primary concern is with the lack of a rigorous design for the work you are doing with this subject. In FY 86 he did 50 form trials on a binary task; follow-up in FY 87 was frustrated when, after a large number of pilot efforts the subject declined formal testing (i is noted that the results of the pilot tests were not encouraging). In FY 88 the subject continued to do vaguely defined tasks which, in my opinion, will make it impossible to attain the primary objective

~~APPROVED:~~ Peter J. McNelis, COTR

DATE 18 Aug 88

of improving single-bit hitting rates in binary tasks since @ base line data are not being collected (or, if FY 86 data is being relied on, it is questionable whether 50 trials is sufficient) and @ we will not have the time to run an adequate number of formal trials in FY 88 to demonstrate improvement.

Specific comments follow:
1. P. 3, 1st para — reference to FY 86 work in Obj E Task 2 is not accurate. Mention is made to the FY 86 effort for the first time in the FY 87 Mid-Year Report (p. 23) und Obj E Task 10

2. p 3, Section A, (1) + (2) — are the techniques referred to in (1) the same as those in (2) or are they external vs internal. Please clarify and specify.

3. p. 3, Section A, General — multiple objectives are confusing and there is no way one could design an experiment at this point regarding the two secondary objectives since @ the technique are not defined and ② formal base line data has not been gathered. These secondary objectives should have been ~~either~~ eliminated or more scientifically addressed.

4. The SOC should have reviewed the "protocol" for this "experiment"

5. p 4, Section C, 1st bullet — implies a binary task is the usual protocol. Is this accurate since much/most of the data being collected appears to ~~be~~ involve multiple ~~task~~ choices.

6. p 4, Section C, last para — alludes to "formal tests". If single bit hitting rates in a binary task are to show improvement they have to demonstrate improvement compared to like base line data +/or ~~be~~ include sufficient trials over time to demonstrate this. The clarification of this is critical.

7. p 5, Section D — indicates a p value of ≤ .033, while the FY 87 Mid Year Tech Report states the p value for the same data is ≤ .024. Also, this paragraph indicates that the FY 86 data was "sensitive" to a putative decline effect"; what does this phrase mean and where is the data to support it?

8. p 5, Section E, 2nd para — states "SRI and sponsor's COTR will determine structure of formal test" — This "arrangement is ~~prior~~ on the contrary, to the arrangement used by me now in this document presented to me in mid-August 1988.

COMMENT 8. (cont'd) I will be happy to input, but see my comment #4 above. (Also, it may well prove to be too late to do a formal test (see my Introductory comments and concerns).

9. p7, Section F, 2nd Sentence. Unclear. Perhaps this should read: "the task was to determine whether ... ETC".

10. p7, Section F, last Sentence — When you say the "remaining 63 trials" are you referring to 63 of the 81 original binary trials? (If the first 18 were thrown out, then it would seem that your total binary trials are just 63 (especially since the first 18 did not fit "your" usual protocol "regarding type of targets).

11. p8, 1st para, 1st Sentence — What are the "specific and different internal strategies" mentioned. This is critical information &, if only Ingo knows the answer (assuming he knows), its not meaningful to us.

12. p8, 1st para, last sentence — What are the "other two hypotheses" you are referring to; where are they so stated?

13. I have also attached the comments made by ████████████ regarding this document. They are also critical of the work and indicate his contention that the work is seriously flawed

SG1J